

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

In the Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment, it is stated that the response dated March 25, 2004 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because Applicant failed to adequately address the 112 rejection set forth therein.


It is respectfully pointed out that in the prior response Applicant amended claim 1 in a bona fide attempt to overcome the 112 rejection. It was only during a telephone conversation with the Examiner held subsequent to the response of March 25, 2004, that Applicant appreciated that the rejection was based on the use of the word 'obtains'.

Accordingly, claim 1 is currently further amended to change the word 'obtains' to 'is obtained', as suggested by the Examiner in the above-referenced telephone conversation.

Claim 8 is currently amended to correct a typographical error.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant urges that all of the pending claims are now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 112 rejection, allow the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584